The role of species charisma in biological invasions

Jaric, Ivan

2020-08

Jaric , I , Courchamp , F , Correia , R A , Crowley , S L , Essl , F , Fischer , A , Gonzalez-Moreno , P , Kalinkat , G , Lambin , X , Lenzner , B , Meinard , Y , Mill , A , Musseau , C , Novoa , A , Pergl , J , Pysek , P , Pyskova , K , Robertson , P , von Schmalensee , M , Shackleton , R T , Stefansson , R A , Stajerova , K , Verissimo , D & Jeschke , J M 2020 , ' The role of species charisma in biological invasions ' , Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment , vol. 18 , no. 6 , pp. 345-352 . https://doi.org/10.1002/fee.2195

http://hdl.handle.net/10138/319668
https://doi.org/10.1002/fee.2195

unspecified
acceptedVersion

The role of species charisma in biological invasions

Ivan Jarić[1,2,*], Franck Courchamp[3], Ricardo A. Correia[4,5,6,7], Sarah L. Crowley[8], Franz Essl[9], Anke Fischer[10], Pablo González-Moreno[11,12], Gregor Kalinkat[13], Xavier Lambin[14], Bernd Lenzner[9], Yves Meinard[15], Aileen Mill[16], Camille Musseau[13,17,18], Ana Novoa[19], Jan Pergl[19], Petr Pyšek[19,20], Klára Pyšková[20], Peter Robertson[16], Menja von Schmalensee[21,22], Ross T. Shackleton[23], Robert A. Stefansson[21], Kateřina Štajerová[19,20], Diogo Veríssimo[24,25,26], Jonathan M. Jeschke[13,17,18]

[1] Biology Centre of the Czech Academy of Sciences, Institute of Hydrobiology, České Budějovice, Czech Republic

[2] University of South Bohemia, Faculty of Science, Department of Ecosystem Biology, České Budějovice, Czech Republic

[3] Ecologie, Systématique and Evolution, Univ. Paris-Sud, CNRS, AgroParisTech, Université Paris-Saclay, Orsay, France

[4] Helsinki Lab of Interdisciplinary Conservation Science (HELICS), Department of Geosciences and Geography, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

[5] Helsinki Institute of Sustainability Science (HELSUS), University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

[6] CESAM - Centre for Environmental and Marine Studies, University of Aveiro, Aveiro, Portugal

[7] Institute of Biological and Health Sciences, Federal University of Alagoas, Maceió, Brazil

[8] Environment and Sustainability Institute, University of Exeter, Penryn, Cornwall, United Kingdom

[9] Department of Botany and Biodiversity Research, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria

[10] Social, Economic and Geographical Sciences, James Hutton Institute, Aberdeen, United Kingdom

[11] CABI, Egham, United Kingdom

[12] Evaluación y Restauración de Sistemas Agrícolas y Forestales RNM360, Departamento de

Ingeniería Forestal, Universidad de Córdoba, Córdoba, Spain

[13] Leibniz-Institute of Freshwater Ecology and Inland Fisheries (IGB), Berlin, Germany

[14] School of Biological Sciences, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, United Kingdom

[15] Université Paris Dauphine, PSL Research University, CNRS, Paris, France

[16] Modelling, Evidence and Policy Group, Newcastle University, Newcastle, United Kingdom

[17] Institute of Biology, Freie Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany

[18] Berlin-Brandenburg Institute of Advanced Biodiversity Research (BBIB), Berlin, Germany

[19] The Czech Academy of Sciences, Institute of Botany, Department of Invasion Ecology, Průhonice, Czech Republic

[20] Department of Ecology, Faculty of Science, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

[21] West Iceland Nature Research Centre, Stykkishólmur, Iceland

[22] Faculty of Life and Environmental Sciences, University of Iceland, Reykjavík, Iceland

[23] Institute of Geography and Sustainability, University of Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland

[24] Department of Zoology, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom

[25] Oxford Martin School, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom

[26] Institute for Conservation Research, San Diego Zoo Global, California, USA

[*] Corresponding author: Ivan Jarić, Biology Centre of the Czech Academy of Sciences, Institute of Hydrobiology, Na Sádkách 702/7, CZ-370 05 České Budějovice, Czech Republic, E-mail: ivan.jaric@hbu.cas.cz, phone: +420 38 777 5855, fax: +420 385 310 24

Abstract

Species charisma, understood as a set of species characteristics and their perception that affect people's attitudes and behaviors, is a highly relevant concept for invasion science, with implications across all stages of the invasion process. However, the concept of invasive alien species (IAS) charisma has not yet been systematically investigated. Here, we discuss this concept, provide a set of recommendations for further research and highlight management implications. We review how charisma affects the processes associated with biological invasions and IAS management, including: effects on species introductions and spread, media portrayals, public perceptions of species management, research attention, and active public involvement in research and management. Explicit consideration of IAS charisma is critical to improve understanding of the drivers of people's attitudes towards particular IAS and planned management measures and strategies, and to implement programs aiming to influence stakeholder perceptions and behavior and to strengthen public engagement.

In a nutshell

- We discuss the concept of charismatic invasive alien species (IAS), highlight management implications and provide a set of recommendations for further research.
- The charisma of IAS might influence all stages of the invasion process, and both charisma and its influence can vary over time and space.
- It is a potential hindrance to management actions by affecting public support and contributing to conflicts.
- We explore the concept of IAS charisma and its effects on biological invasions and management, including species introductions, media portrayal, public perceptions, opposition to management, research effort and public participation in research and management.

Introduction

The concept of charismatic species – which is commonly used in the literature to refer to the "attractiveness", "appeal" or "beauty" of species (Panel 1) – has recently garnered attention in conservation science due to its potential to stimulate public awareness and support, especially through the use of flagship species (Veríssimo *et al*. 2011; Courchamp *et al*. 2018). The charisma of any introduced species, and invasive alien species (IAS) in particular, can affect people's perceptions of the species and their attitudes towards management (McNeely 2001; Veitch and Clout 2001; Shackleton *et al*. 2019). There is ample evidence in the literature of IAS charisma influencing the invasion process across a wide range of taxa spanning different taxonomic groups and regions (WebTables 1-3; Figure 1). As opposed to a positive effect of charisma in the management of threatened species, IAS charisma most often represents a hindrance to management actions (Genovesi and Bertolino 2001; Bertolino and Genovesi 2003). It can reduce public support for management attempts and contribute to conflicts, and ultimately impede management efforts, for example by delaying or preventing control implementation (Estévez *et al*. 2015; Novoa *et al*. 2018). However, the issue of species charisma in relation to IAS has not yet been systematically explored.

Here we discuss the concept of species charisma in the context of IAS, exploring how it can affect actions and processes, such as species introductions, media portrayal, public perception, opposition to management, research effort and public participation in research and management (Figure 1). In addition to clarifying the concept of charismatic IAS (Panel 1), we illustrate how the perception of charisma is highly context-dependent and varies over space and time. Identifying these issues enables us to provide a set of recommendations for further research and to highlight both management implications and measures that can be taken to address this issue.

Effects of charisma on introductions and establishment success

It is likely that charisma has an effect on introduction and establishment rates, especially in certain taxonomic groups and introduction pathways, such as the ornamental plant, aquarium and pet trade (Padilla and Williams 2004; van Kleunen *et al*. 2018). For example, aquarium releases are recognized as a key contemporary introduction pathway for invasive aquatic species, and are responsible for the introduction of as much as one third of the world's ecologically and economically most damaging aquatic IAS (Padilla and Williams 2004). Such aquatic ornamental species, as well as terrestrial ones, are not randomly selected, but chosen for specific, appealing traits, resulting in higher demand for charismatic species in the pet and horticultural trades (Chucholl and Wendler 2017; van Kleunen *et al*. 2018; Kutlvašr *et al.* 2019). Although this remains to be quantified, it is likely that the increased prominence of such charismatic species within the pool of traded and reared species can lead to increased prominence in the introduced species pool and, hence, to a higher propagule pressure. While charisma probably has negligible effects on inadvertent introductions (e.g. by ballast water or seed contamination) or those mainly driven by perceived utility (e.g. crop species), all else being equal, we hypothesize that charismatic species should have a comparatively higher overall chance of being introduced than non-charismatic species. Species charisma could thus potentially shape the composition of the introduced species pool, and charismatic species could consequently also be more likely to become established than non-charismatic species. In fact, some of the best-known IAS introductions were likely influenced by their charisma. The raccoon (*Procyon lotor*) is a good example: raccoons are very charismatic due to their "cute" appearance with their facial color patterns resembling a bandit's mask across their eyes, their behavior that is perceived as comical and their endearing habit of dousing, supposed washing of food prior to eating. The raccoon became popular as a pet animal in Japan, where it is an alien species, and many individuals were imported, allegedly due to the popularity of the animated cartoon 'Rascal Raccoon' on TV in 1977; it has since become invasive across the

country (Ikeda *et al*. 2004). Other examples feature in Figure 2 and WebTables 1-3. However, what constitutes charisma is dynamic, changing over time and differing among cultures. This limits the predictive power of analyses of future charisma-driven invasions or their management based on historic events.

Charisma can also have a strong effect on the establishment success of introduced species, through public support and active provisioning of resources. Typical examples include winter-food provisioning for charismatic alien parakeets via bird feeders (Crowley *et al*. 2019) and feeding of feral cats (*Felis catus*) and dogs (*Canis familiaris*; Allen 2018).

Interestingly, some species traits contribute to both the establishment potential of a species and the likelihood that it will be perceived as charismatic, which makes them especially relevant for invasion risk assessments. For example, long flowering periods or multiple flowering events and plant height are particularly desirable in ornamental plants, and are also traits that are positively associated with establishment success and invasiveness (Pyšek and Richardson 2008; van Kleunen *et al*. 2018). Similarly, many alien bird species that were successfully introduced by acclimatization societies in the 19th and 20th centuries were commonly characterized by a combination of appealing features and traits that facilitated their establishment and spread.

Effects of IAS charisma on media and communication

Beside direct experience with IAS impacts, public awareness and perception of IAS can stem largely from indirect sources of information such as the media, and charisma is expected to affect the style and tone of language used by media outlets (Veitch and Clout 2001; Larson 2005). These media portrayals are more likely to feature either charismatic species or those with serious environmental or economic impacts (Veitch and Clout 2001; Wilson *et al*. 2007; Jarić *et al*. 2019). The public perception of species charisma can therefore be influenced (both positively and negatively) by the way species are portrayed, via increased media exposure, or by emphasizing

specific points of view (Figure 3; Veitch and Clout 2001; Crowley *et al*. 2017; Shackleton *et al*. 2019). For example, public perception and the stance of official bodies towards the Nootka lupine (*Lupinus nootkatensis*) in Iceland shifted from positive to largely negative because of an ongoing public debate in the media (Petursdottir *et al.* 2013; Benediktsson 2015). Effects of IAS charisma and their media representation and communication are essentially inter-related, they affect each other, and the way species will be ultimately perceived.

Messages emphasized with emotive language may result in partial reporting and public misinformation (Crowley *et al*. 2019). For example, reports of the planned control program for invasive eastern grey squirrels (*Sciurus carolinensis*; Figure 2b) in Italy by newspapers and animal rights groups used emotive messages by associating them with cute cartoon characters, which greatly affected public perception and attitude towards the species (Genovesi and Bertolino 2001). This led to protracted legal proceedings, a withdrawal of funding and thus contributed to the failure of the eradication campaign (Genovesi and Bertolino 2001; Shackleton *et al*. 2019). Management of some IAS can be associated with intense conflicts where various stakeholders (e.g. journalists, scientists, resource managers, governmental institutions, non-governmental organizations) have frequently resorted to militaristic language and combative, war-like metaphors to pursue and advocate desired research and management activities (Larson 2005; Wallach *et al*. 2018). While the way such conflicts emerge or escalate might be affected by stakeholders' perceptions of IAS charisma, the manner in which their perceptions are communicated might in turn also affect perceived charisma (eg by referring to a plant species as a weed, or to an animal species as a pest). A good example is *Echium plantagineum*, a European herb introduced to Australia, where it is called ‘Salvation Jane’ in South Australia and ‘Patterson's curse’ elsewhere in the country (Kueffer and Kull 2017). While the name reflects how the species is perceived regionally (ie as either a useful crop or a noxious weed), the choice of the name in turn also affects perception of the plant by the public.

Effects of IAS charisma on their societal acceptance

Perceptions of the natural state of the environment are to a large extent socially constructed and context-dependent (Backstrom *et al*. 2018). Public attitudes towards species can be influenced by their origin, but other factors are usually more important, such as economic value and impact (van der Wal *et al*. 2015), or charisma (Gobster 2011; WebTables 1-3). For example, big trees are often valued by the public regardless of their origin (Gobster 2011).

IAS may become accepted by the public as desirable elements of local fauna and flora, often as an instance of the shifting baseline syndrome, which represents a gradual change in the accepted norms due to a lack of experience, memory or knowledge (Soga and Gaston 2018; Beever *et al.* 2019). Over time, expectations of what is a truly original and desirable state of the natural environment change (Soga and Gaston 2018), and the ability of people to recognize a species as alien decreases with the time that has passed since introduction (Garcia-Llorente *et al*. 2008).

The readiness of the public to accept an alien species as the "new normal" likely increases with perceived charisma, especially if a species has become associated with cultural practices or perceptions of the place (Nuñez and Simberloff 2005; Verbrugge *et al*. 2013). For example, after being introduced in southeast Spain for different economic reasons, *Agave* and *Opuntia* species have invaded large arid areas where they built charisma over time and became iconic symbols of the landscape that has been depicted in stamps and postmarks (Figure 2c). *Jacaranda* trees also became iconic in South Africa and a symbol of Pretoria, nicknamed the "Jacaranda City" (Dickie *et al*. 2014). Alien species can become integrated into cultural identities through positive interactions and emotional and material attachments, and such processes can occur rather quickly in the case of charismatic species (Crowley *et al*. 2017, 2018). For example, monk parakeets (*Myiopsitta monachus*) in Chicago became an iconic species for the city in less than 50 years since their introduction (Crowley *et al*. 2017). The ruddy duck (*Oxyura jamaicensis*) was adopted as the

emblem of the birdwatchers' club in the region of the UK where it was first introduced. Many alien species are nowadays considered desirable and might even be subject to protection or restoration measures in case of threats or population declines (Clavero 2014; Crowley *et al*. 2018). In some cases, IAS charisma can be a relevant source for economy, for example through tourism, which will further promote their societal acceptance (Panel 2).

Effects of charisma on the likelihood of public opposition to IAS management

A lack of public support for IAS management, or even opposition against IAS removal, is not uncommon (Crowley *et al*. 2017; Novoa *et al*. 2018), and can also be affected by IAS charisma (Fischer *et al*. 2014). Plans to control species perceived as charismatic have often faced opposition, while no such resistance is the norm for species that are not perceived as charismatic, except those with economic value (Liordos *et al*. 2017). Some well-known instances where public opposition hindered IAS control due to perceived charisma include invasive populations of monk parakeets and mute swans (*Cygnus olor*) in the United States, and hippopotamuses (*Hippopotamus amphibius*) in Colombia (Panel 2; Ellis and Elphick 2007; Dembitzer 2017; Crowley *et al*. 2019). Conflicts also frequently arise surrounding attempts to control feral populations of charismatic pets and domestic animals, such as cats, dogs and horses (*Equus caballus*; Veitch and Clout 2001; Estévez *et al*. 2015; Allen 2018). Due to a strong taxonomic bias in perceptions of charisma, public opposition against control of invasive mammal or bird species is more likely to occur than against invertebrates or plants (Shackleton *et al*. 2019). However, attempts to control charismatic alien plants, such as large pines (*Pinus* spp.) or eucalypti (*Eucalyptus spp.*), have also faced some opposition (Nuñez and Simberloff 2005; Dickie et al. 2014; Estévez *et al*. 2015).

There also seems to be a relationship between species charisma and a public consensus on acceptability of particular control measures – for more charismatic species, there is often less acceptance of direct and lethal control methods (Verbrugge *et al*. 2013; Fischer *et al*. 2014).

Opposition by some vocal sections of the public has sometimes forced management authorities to use alternative, non-lethal, and often more expensive methods such as reproduction control or relocation, even though they may be less effective (Bertolino and Genovesi 2003; Verbrugge *et al*. 2013; Panel 2).

Effects of IAS charisma on research efforts and funding availability

Invasion science is taxonomically biased, and only a minority of IAS are studied in detail (Wilson *et al*. 2007; Pyšek *et al*. 2008). While the taxonomic focus is largely determined by their impacts (Pyšek *et al*. 2008), there is also greater focus on invasive vertebrates than invertebrates, as well as greater focus on large and charismatic species (Wilson *et al*. 2007). Research biases can lead to knowledge gaps, and may negatively affect conservation prioritization, management effectiveness, international decision-making and policy development (Donaldson et al. 2016).

We hypothesize that IAS charisma can also affect research effort, with charismatic IAS receiving more research interest, ~~ie~~ e.g.~~?~~ through personal researcher preferences or potentially greater funding availabilities. Although this is not yet tested within the field of invasion science, there is a well-established effect of charisma in conservation science (Clark and May 2002; Fleming and Bateman 2016; Jarić *et al*. 2019). Furthermore, social sciences and humanities are interested in personal and societal discourses, changes and events (eg cognitive changes, personal attitudes and behaviors, and conflict processes; Schüttler *et al*. 2011). Such societal dynamics are more likely to arise from charismatic IAS and therefore more likely to lead to comparatively greater research effort focused on socio-cultural aspects of charismatic IAS, with more funding allocated. On the other hand, applied research can also be hindered by reduced funding support and public opposition to management. Such was the case for an eastern grey squirrel population in Italy, where public opposition obstructed a pilot research project on its eradication (Genovesi and Bertolino 2001).

Effects of IAS charisma on active public involvement in research and management

Volunteer initiatives are increasingly recognized as an affordable tool to manage biological invasions (Pagès *et al*. 2018). However, public involvement in controlling highly charismatic species may in some cases be limited (Crowley *et al*. 2018). Unappealing features and negative perception of a species can be more beneficial for control efforts, as it is the case for cane toad (*Rhinella marina*) invasions in Australia, where the strong aversion against this species attracted significant volunteer efforts for various management activities (Estévez *et al*. 2015).

Nevertheless, IAS charisma can also have potentially positive effects in some cases, for example by motivating the public to actively engage in hunting, fishing, or other public initiatives directed at invaders perceived as attractive game species (Green *et al*. 2017). For example, annual hunting derbies directed at charismatic invasive Indo-Pacific lionfish (*Pterois volitans*/*miles*) in the Western Atlantic have attracted substantial volunteer effort and proved to be effective for local population suppression (Green *et al*. 2017). Some of the traits that contribute to species charisma may simultaneously make them easier to detect (e.g. bright colors, large body size, unique morphology), thus increasing the efficiency of monitoring programs and citizen science initiatives. However, any management initiative based on public promotion of IAS charisma needs to be evaluated against the associated risks, such as promoting further invasions, incorporation of such species into local cultures (Nuñez *et al*. 2012), and promoting public engagement that may also target threatened native species.

IAS charisma can also motivate the active involvement of specific groups, such as aquarium hobbyists, to contribute to scientific research, education and awareness raising, as well as to campaigns on IAS trade and introduction control (Maceda-Veiga *et al*. 2016). In some cases, it can also stimulate public involvement through the use of the flagship species concept (Panel 3).

Concluding remarks and ways forward

We argue that it is crucial to recognize explicitly the importance of charisma surrounding IAS if we want to fully understand the extent of human contributions to biological invasions, and management successes and failures (WebFigure 1). Interventions to change attitudes and behaviors towards charismatic IAS, as well as to raise awareness of their potential impacts, can reduce risks arising from trade and cultivation of high-risk invaders and their introductions. It can also bolster support for control measures and volunteer participation in management initiatives. Perception of species charisma is highly context- and culture-dependent (Lorimer 2007), and can be affected and modified through targeted activities (Veríssimo *et al*. 2017; Panel 1). Some conservationists have advocated behavior change interventions, a set of techniques aimed at influencing people's choices in ways that will positively affect the environment (Byerly *et al*. 2018). In addition to behavioral changes, these types of strategies are also able to affect attitudes towards IAS and charisma perception.

Open communication, improved collaboration and engagement among scientists, managers and key stakeholders can considerably reduce the risk of conflicts, and foster establishment of joint management goals and initiatives (Fischer *et al*. 2014; Crowley *et al*. 2017; Novoa *et al*. 2018). Conflicts, especially when involving charismatic IAS, can sometimes stem from the apparent incompatibility of two different ethical perspectives, between those prioritizing ecosystem health or species conservation on one hand, and those concerned for the welfare of individuals of the alien species in question on the other (Genovesi and Bertolino 2001; Wallach *et al*. 2018).

It is critical to improve understanding and anticipation of public perceptions towards particular IAS, and to consider the power of charisma in management planning and its role in particular management scenarios. Moreover, any effects of IAS charisma on different facets of human well-being should also be defined and integrated within established frameworks for socioeconomic impact classification (Bacher *et al*. 2018). While quantifying the effect of species charisma on the invasion process is challenging due to subjectivity and instability of societal

charisma perceptions (Panel 1), future studies should try to address this issue. Improved understanding of IAS charisma will require careful consideration of values, perceptions and cultural background of different stakeholders, as well as of cultural trends and variability (Garcia-Llorente *et al*. 2008; Crowley *et al*. 2017). Research based on social scientific methods will be key to provide a better understanding of IAS characteristics, societal values and other factors that give rise to IAS charisma. Digital approaches, involving analysis of large bodies of text and other media, could represent valuable additional research tools to explore human culture, identify key traits and drivers of IAS charisma, and understand and monitor public perceptions of IAS and their trends over space and time (Ladle *et al*. 2016).

Acknowledgements

We thank David L. Strayer for valuable comments and suggestions on an earlier version of the manuscript, as well as Lad Akins, Benjamin Allen, David Bierbach, Jindřich Brejcha, Kenneth Cox, David Echeverri López, Stephanie Green, David Hall, , Matthew A. Young and Boronia Veterinary Clinic and Animal Hospital for providing the photographs. IJ's work was supported by the J. E. Purkyně Fellowship of the Czech Academy of Sciences, and the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation. AN, JP, KP, KŠ and PP were supported by EXPRO grant SynHab, no. 19-28807X (Czech Science Foundation), long-term research development project RVO 67985939 (The Czech Academy of Sciences) and (DG16P02M041; NAKI II of the Ministry of Culture of the Czech Republic). FC was supported through the Invacost grants by the ANR and the Foundation BNP Paribas. FE and BL were supported by the Austrian Science Foundation FWF (grant I3757-B29) and JMJ by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG; grant JE 288/9-2). CM was supported by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF, BIBS project grant 01LC1501A-H). PGM was supported by CABI Development Fund (with contributions from DFID (UK), ACIAR (Australia) and DGIS (NLs)) and by a JdC-Incorporación contract (IJCI-2017-31733). RAC

is currently supported by funding from the Helsinki Institute of Sustainability Science and the University of Helsinki. GK acknowledges funding from the BMBF through the project “GLANCE” (Global Change Effects in River Ecosystems; 01 LN1320A). DV was supported by the Oxford Martin School Oxford Martin Programme for the Illegal Wildlife Trade. This study is a contribution of the Invasion Dynamics Network (InDyNet) funded by the DFG (grant JE 288/8-1). The authors also thank two anonymous reviewers and the editor for providing helpful comments and suggestions that improved the quality of the paper.

References:

Albert C, Luque GM, and Courchamp F. 2018. The twenty most charismatic species. *PloS One* **13**: e0199149.

Allen BL. 2018. And the people's choice award goes to… dogs: a comment on Home et al. *Anim Conserv* **21:** 283-284.

Bacher S, Blackburn TM, Essl F, *et al*. 2018. Socio-economic impact classification of alien taxa (SEICAT). *Methods Ecol Evol* ***9***: 159-168.

Backstrom AC, Garrard GE, Hobbs RJ, *et al*. 2018. Grappling with the social dimensions of novel ecosystems. *Front Ecol Environ* **16**: 109-117.

Beever EA, Simberloff D, Crowley SL, *et al*. 2019. Social–ecological mismatches create conservation challenges in introduced species management. *Front Ecol Environ* **17**: 117-125.

Benediktsson K. 2015. Floral hazards: Nootka lupin in Iceland and the complex politics of invasive

351 life. *Geogr Ann B Hum Geogr* **97**: 139-154.
352
353 Bertolino S and Genovesi P. 2003. Spread and attempted eradication of the grey squirrel (*Sciurus*
354 *carolinensis*) in Italy, and consequences for the red squirrel (*Sciurus vulgaris*) in Eurasia. *Biol*
355 *Conserv* **109**: 351-358.
356
357 Blackburn TM, Pyšek P, Bacher S, *et al*. 2011. A proposed unified framework for biological
358 invasions. *Trends Ecol Evol* **26**: 333-339.
359
360 Byerly H, Balmford A, Ferraro PJ, *et al*. 2018. Nudging pro-environmental behavior: evidence and
361 opportunities. *Front Ecol Environ* **16**: 159-168.
362
363 Chucholl C and Wendler F. 2017. Positive selection of beautiful invaders: long-term persistence
364 and bio-invasion risk of freshwater crayfish in the pet trade. *Biol Invasions* **19**: 197-208.
365
366 Clark JA and May RM. 2002. Taxonomic bias in conservation research. *Science* **297***:* 191-192.
367
368 Clavero M. 2014. Shifting baselines and the conservation of non-native species. *Conserv Biol* **28**:
369 1434-1436.
370
371 Courchamp F, Jarić I, Albert C, *et al*. 2018. The paradoxical extinction of the most charismatic
372 animals. *PLoS Biol* **16**: e2003997.
373
374 Crowley SL, Hinchliffe S, and McDonald RA. 2017. Conflict in invasive species management.
375 *Front Ecol Environ* **15**: 133–141.

376

377 Crowley SL, Hinchliffe S, and McDonald RA. 2018. Killing squirrels: exploring motivations and
378 practices of lethal wildlife management. *Environ Plan E* **1**: 120-143.

379

380 Crowley SL, Hinchliffe S, and McDonald RA. 2019. The Parakeet Protectors: understanding
381 opposition to introduced species management. *J Environ Manage* **229**: 120-132.

382

383 Dembitzer J. 2017. The Case for Hippos in Colombia. *Isr J Ecol Evol* **63**: 5-8.

384

385 Dickie IA, Bennett BM, Burrows LE, *et al*. 2014. Conflicting values: ecosystem services and
386 invasive tree management. *Biol Invasions* **16**: 705-719.

387

388 Donaldson MR, Burnett NJ, Braun DC, *et al*. 2016. Taxonomic bias and international biodiversity
389 conservation research. *Facets* **1**: 105-113.

390

391 Ellis MM and Elphick CS. 2007. Using a stochastic model to examine the ecological, economic and
392 ethical consequences of population control in a charismatic invasive species: mute swans in North
393 America. *J Appl Ecol* **44**: 312-322.

394

395 Estévez RA, Anderson CB, Pizarro JC, *et al*. 2015. Clarifying values, risk perceptions, and attitudes
396 to resolve or avoid social conflicts in invasive species management. *Conserv Biol* **29**: 19-30.

397

398 Fischer A, Selge S, van der Wal R, and Larson BMH. 2014. The public and professionals reason
399 similarly about the management of non-native invasive species: a quantitative investigation of the
400 relationship between beliefs and attitudes. *PLoS One* **9**: e105495.

401

402 Fleming PA and Bateman PW. 2016. The good, the bad, and the ugly: which Australian terrestrial
403 mammal species attract most research? *Mammal Rev* **46**: 241-254.

404

405 García-Llorente M, Martín-López B, González JA, *et al*. 2008. Social perceptions of the impacts
406 and benefits of invasive alien species: implications for management. *Biol Conserv* **141**: 2969-2983.

407

408 Genovesi P and Bertolino S. 2001. Human dimension aspects in invasive alien species issues: the
409 case of the failure of the grey squirrel eradication project in Italy. In: McNeely JA (Ed.). The Great
410 Reshuffling: Human Dimensions of Invasive Alien Species. Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge,
411 UK: IUCN.

412

413 Gobster PH. 2011. Factors affecting people's responses to invasive species management. In:
414 Rotherham ID and Lambert RA (Eds.). Invasive and Introduced Plants and Animals: Human
415 Perceptions, Attitudes and Approaches to Management. London, UK and Washington, DC:
416 Earthscan.

417

418 Green SJ, Underwood EB, and Akins JL. 2017. Mobilizing volunteers to sustain local suppression
419 of a global marine invasion. *Conserv Lett* **10**: 726-735.

420

421 Ikeda T, Asano M, Yohei Matoba Y, *et al*. 2004. Present status of invasive alien raccoon and its
422 impact in Japan. *Glob Environ Res* **8**: 125-131.

423

424 Jarić I, Correia RA, Roberts DL, *et al*. 2019. On the overlap between scientific and societal
425 taxonomic attentions—Insights for conservation. *Sci Total Environ* **648**: 772-778.

Kueffer C and Kull CA. 2017. Non-native species and the aesthetics of nature. In: Montserrat Vilà M and Hulme PE (Eds.). Impact of Biological Invasions on Ecosystem Services. Berlin, Germany: Springer.

Kutlvašr J, Pergl J, Baroš A, *et al.* 2019. Survival, dynamics of spread and invasive potential of species in perennial plantations. *Biol Invas* **21**: 561-573.

Ladle RJ, Correia RA, Do Y, *et al*. 2016. Conservation culturomics. *Front Ecol Environ* **14**: 270-276.

Larson BM. 2005. The war of the roses: demilitarizing invasion biology. *Front Ecol Environ* **3**: 495-500.

Liordos V, Kontsiotis VJ, Georgari M, *et al*. 2017. Public acceptance of management methods under different human–wildlife conflict scenarios. *Sci Total Environ* **579**: 685-693.

Lorimer J. 2007. Nonhuman charisma. *Environ Plan D* **25**: 911-932.

Lukas JAY, Kalinkat G, Kempkes M, *et al*. 2017. Feral guppies in Germany - a critical evaluation of a citizen science approach as biomonitoring tool. *Bull Fish Biol* **17**: 13-27.

Maceda-Veiga A, Domínguez-Domínguez O, Escribano-Alacid J, *et al*. 2016. The aquarium hobby: can sinners become saints in freshwater fish conservation? *Fish Fish* **17**: 860-874.

451 Mack RN. 2001. Motivations and consequences of the human dispersal of plants. In: McNeely JA
452 (Ed.). The Great Reshuffling: Human Dimensions of Invasive Alien Species. Gland, Switzerland
453 and Cambridge, UK: IUCN.
454
455 McNeely JA. 2001. An introduction to human dimensions of invasive alien species. In: McNeely
456 JA (Ed.). The Great Reshuffling: Human Dimensions of Invasive Alien Species. Gland, Switzerland
457 and Cambridge, UK: IUCN.
458
459 Melero Y. 2017. Communication of flagship species in conservation: lessons from invasive
460 management projects. *Biodivers Conserv* **26**: 2973-2978.
461
462 Novoa A, Shackleton R, Canavan S, *et al*. 2018. A framework for engaging stakeholders on the
463 management of alien species. *J Environ Manage* **205**: 286-297.
464
465 Nuñez MA and Simberloff D. 2005. Invasive species and the cultural keystone species concept.
466 *Ecol Soc* **10**: r4.
467
468 Nuñez MA, Kuebbing S, Dimarco RD, *et al*. 2012. Invasive species: to eat or not to eat, that is the
469 question. *Conserv Lett* **5**: 334-341.
470
471 Padilla DK and Williams SL. 2004. Beyond ballast water: aquarium and ornamental trades as
472 sources of invasive species in aquatic ecosystems. *Front Ecol Environ* **2**: 131-138.
473
474 Pagès M, Fischer A, and van der Wal R. 2018. The dynamics of volunteer motivations for engaging
475 in the management of invasive plants: Insights from a mixed-methods study on Scottish seabird

476 islands. *J Environ Plann Manage* **61**: 904-923.
477
478 Patoka J, Magalhães ALB, Kouba A, *et al*. 2018. Invasive aquatic pets: failed policies increase risks
479 of harmful invasions. *Biodivers Conserv* **27**: 3037-3046.
480
481 Petursdottir T, Aradottir AL and Benediktsson K. 2013. An evaluation of the short-term progress
482 of restoration combining ecological assessment and public perception. *Restoration Ecology* **21** No.
483 1: 75–85.
484
485 Pyšek P and Richardson DM. 2008. Traits associated with invasiveness in alien plants: where do we
486 stand? In: Nentwig W (Ed.). Biological Invasions. Berlin, Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.
487
488 Pyšek P, Richardson DM, Pergl J, *et al*. 2008. Geographical and taxonomic biases in invasion
489 ecology. *Trends Ecol Evol* **23**: 237-244.
490
491 Schüttler E, Rozzi R, and Jax K. 2011. Towards a societal discourse on invasive species
492 management: a case study of public perceptions of mink and beavers in Cape Horn. *J Nat Conserv*
493 **19**: 175-184.
494
495 Shackleton RT, Richardson DM, Shackleton CM, *et al*. 2019. Explaining people's perceptions of
496 invasive alien species: a conceptual framework. *J Environ Manage* **229**: 10-26.
497
498 Soga M and Gaston KJ. 2018. Shifting baseline syndrome: causes, consequences and implications.
499 *Front Ecol Environ* **16**: 222-230.
500

van der Wal R, Fischer A, Selge S, *et al*. 2015. Neither the public nor experts judge species primarily on their origins. *Environ Conserv* **42**: 349-355.

van Kleunen M, Essl F, Pergl J, *et al*. 2018. The changing role of ornamental horticulture in alien plant invasions. *Biol Rev* **93**: 1421-1437.

Veitch CR and Clout MN. 2001. Human dimensions in the management of invasive species in New Zealand. In: McNeely JA (Ed.). The Great Reshuffling: Human Dimensions of Invasive Alien Species. Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK: IUCN.

Verbrugge LN, Van den Born RJ, and Lenders HR. 2013. Exploring public perception of non-native species from a visions of nature perspective. *Environ Manage* **52**: 1562-1573.

Veríssimo D, MacMillan DC, and Smith RJ. 2011. Toward a systematic approach for identifying conservation flagships. *Conserv Lett* **4**: 1-8.

Veríssimo D, Vaughan G, Ridout M, *et al*. 2017. Increased conservation marketing effort has major fundraising benefits for even the least popular species. *Biol Conserv* **211**: 95-101.

Wallach AD, Bekoff M, Batavia C, *et al*. 2018. Summoning compassion to address the challenges of conservation. *Conserv Biol* **32**: 1255-1265.

Wilson JR, Procheş Ş, Braschler B, *et al*. 2007. The (bio)diversity of science reflects the interests of society. *Front Ecol Environ* **5**: 409-414.

Panel 1. Invasive alien species (IAS) charisma

Species charisma is a highly complex concept, and there is currently no consensus on definitions (Lorimer 2007; Albert *et al*. 2018). It is used in the literature to refer to "attractiveness", "appeal" or "beauty" of species but, except for the seminal work by Lorimer (2007), very few studies actually state what the term signifies or what its properties are (Albert *et al*. 2018; Crowley *et al*. 2019). Lorimer (2007) refers to it as "non-human charisma" and defines it as a concept that lies somewhere between inherent species characteristics on the one hand and subjective perceptions and values assigned by humans on the other; the latter are generated through direct or indirect human interactions with the species (Crowley *et al*. 2019). Being highly subjective, perceptions around charisma can change over time or even be enhanced or constructed (Lorimer 2007). Lorimer identifies that charisma is not always unambiguously positive; for example, species can be both charismatic and perceived as frightening (e. g. sharks, anacondas). In wider use, however, and particularly in conservation, the term is applied to those species whose characteristics and behavior tend to inspire positive responses in humans. In conservation science and practice, charisma is closely associated with the flagship species concept, and used for scientific communication and attracting funds (Albert *et al*. 2018).

Our definition of charismatic species, and of charismatic IAS in particular, therefore relates to species whose characteristics affect people's perceptions, attitudes and behaviors surrounding them. We refer here to the behavior of both management activities by institutions and reactions of the general society. Characteristics that are driving species charisma can be visual (e.g. unique morphology), acoustic (e.g. particular sounds produced, such as bird calls), olfactory (e.g. emission of pleasant smells, fragrances of flowering plants), behavioral (e.g. complex or anthropomorphic behavior), or symbolic (e.g. abstract characteristics embedded in the general culture). However, it is important to bear in mind that species charisma is highly context-dependent, that it varies over

551 space and time, and that it is influenced by regional, social and cultural factors, as well as individual
552 value systems (Shackleton et al. 2019). For example, people can have strikingly differing
553 perceptions of squirrels, either considering them charismatic due to their features, such as large eyes
554 or bushy tails, or disliking them due to their rodent-like characteristics (Shackleton *et al*. 2019). A
555 detailed overview of factors driving human perceptions of IAS was provided by Shackleton *et al*.
556 (2019).

557 Although the definition of species charisma is elusive, some animal traits are known to
558 contribute to charisma, such as body size, distinctive coloration patterns, furry coat, peculiar
559 appearance, neotenic features and sentience (Gobster 2011; Shackleton *et al*. 2019; Beever *et al.*
560 2019). Feral populations of domestic animals are especially likely to be charismatic (Veitch and
561 Clout 2001). Charisma is also a feature attached to some plants, where it is strongly driven by traits
562 such as flower colors, size and fragrance, and foliage shape (Mack 2001; Veitch and Clout 2001;
563 Gobster 2011; Shackleton *et al*. 2019).

564

565 **Panel 2. The case of feral hippos in Colombia**

566 A small population of feral hippopotamuses (*Hippopotamus amphibius*) currently lives in
567 the Rio Magdalena valley in Northeastern Colombia, and represents an outstanding case of a
568 charismatic IAS (Figure 4). Drug cartel leader Pablo Escobar illegally imported four hippos for the
569 establishment of a private zoo on his estate in the early 1980s, but after his death in 1993 and
570 subsequent forfeiture of his estate, they turned to roaming the surrounding countryside and have
571 been reproducing successfully ever since, with potential negative impacts on native communities
572 (Dembitzer 2017). There have been several unsuccessful attempts to control the growth of the
573 population that is currently estimated to consist of up to 70 individuals. Culling initiatives were
574 abandoned due to strong public opposition in 2009, and sterilization plans have been stopped due to
575 high costs and risk for both hippos and humans during the procedure. Hippos are considered as one

of the most charismatic animal species, mainly based on their impressive body size and appearance (Albert *et al*. 2018). They are appreciated by the local communities, perceived as an important tourism factor and increasingly featured as decorative motifs in public spaces and commercial enterprises.

Panel 3. Potential of the flagship species concept in IAS management

The concept of flagship species was developed to focus conservation marketing campaigns on species with traits that are perceived as charismatic, and thus to attract public support and funding for conservation efforts, e.g. giant panda (*Ailuropoda melanoleuca*; Veríssimo *et al*. 2011). However, while charisma is one of the key parameters that determine the flagship potential of a species, IAS charisma can constrain management by diminishing support for control measures. In practice, IAS charisma is often taken into account during promotion campaigns, by either excluding charismatic invaders from promotional material when control measures are advocated, as was the case for the invasive brush-tailed possum (*Trichosurus vulpecula*) in New Zealand, or conversely by promoting the charismatic perspective of IAS in case of campaigns that oppose control measures (McNeely 2001).

Use of charismatic IAS as flagship species can be beneficial for monitoring programs and citizen science initiatives, where they can help motivate volunteers to become engaged in sampling or monitoring activities. For example, guppies (*Poecilia reticulata*) were promoted as flagship species of a citizen science project directed at monitoring alien fish species in thermal waters in Germany (Figure 2d; Lukas *et al*. 2017).

The most promising way to apply the flagship species concept in IAS management is arguably to focus on the charismatic species that are impacted by IAS. Such conservation marketing campaigns can be focused either on the species threatened by IAS, or on selected species pairs, represented by the IAS and its charismatic victim. The “flagship victim” charisma can potentially

mitigate effects of IAS charisma on public support for management, and this concept is already used for some local IAS management actions. Examples include the endangered southern cassowary (*Casuarius casuarius*) promoted as a flagship victim of feral pigs (*Sus scrofa*) in Queensland, Australia (McNeely 2001); the "SOS Puffin" project with Atlantic puffin (*Fratercula arctica*) as a flagship victim of the invasive mallow tree (*Lavatera arborea*) in the Firth of Forth islands in Scotland (Pagès *et al*. 2018); and the water vole (*Arvicola amphibius*) as a flagship victim of American mink (*Neovison vison*) in Scotland (Melero 2017).

Figure captions

Figure 1. Overview of different mechanisms through which invasive alien species (IAS) charisma affects different invasion stages and management measures. Invasion stages are based on the framework by Blackburn *et al*. (2011). Red fields and arrows – charisma effects that tend to hinder IAS management; green fields and arrows – charisma effects that tend to facilitate IAS management; bicolored fields and arrows – charisma effects that can either hinder or facilitate IAS management, depending on circumstances.

Figure 2. Examples of invasive alien species (IAS) charisma effects on biological invasions and management measures: (a) introduction rates – introduction of pontic rhododendron (*Rhododendron ponticum*) was to a great extent driven by its charisma (Mack 2001; photo by Kenneth Cox); (b) IAS charisma gives rise to public opposition to control measures – proposed control measures for introduced eastern grey squirrel (*Sciurus carolinensis*) populations in Italy were delayed and made ineffective by strong public opposition (Bertolino and Genovesi 2003; photo by Jonathan Jeschke); (c) IAS charisma contributes to the acceptance of IAS by the society – *Opuntia* species in Spain became an iconic symbol in the landscape, depicted even in stamps and postmarks (photo by Pablo

González-Moreno); (d) IAS charisma can contribute to volunteer involvement in citizen science projects – guppies (*Poecilia reticulata*) were promoted as flagship species of a citizen science project directed at monitoring alien fish species in thermal waters in Germany (Lukas *et al*. 2017; photo by David Bierbach).

Figure 3. The way IAS is presented in media can strongly affect how it is perceived by the public: (a) "Pikachu" possum (*Trichosurus vulpecula;* photo by Boronia Veterinary Clinic and Animal Hospital); (b) a possum and black rat (*Rattus rattus*) eating chicks from a song thrush (*Turdus philomelos*) nest (photo by Ngā Manu Images). All three species represent IAS in New Zealand.

Figure 4. Population of feral hippopotamuses (*Hippopotamus amphibius*) in the valley of the Rio Magdalena in Northeastern Colombia (photo by David Echeverri López).